arXiv:1302.7249v2 [math.DS] 30 Apr 2013

THE DYNAMICS OF SEMIGROUPS OF TRANSCENDENTAL ENTIRE FUNCTIONS

DINESH KUMAR AND SANJAY KUMAR

Abstract. In this paper we consider the dynamics associated with an arbitrary semigroup of transcendental entire functions. Fatou-Julia theory is used to investigate the dynamics of these semigroups. Several results of the dynamics associated with iteration of a transcendental entire function have been extended to transcendental semigroup case. We also investigate the dynamics of conjugate semigroups and Abelian transcendental semigroups.

1. Introduction

A natural extension of complex dynamics is to investigate the dynamics of a sequence of different functions by means of composition which was first studied by Hinkkanen and Martin [9] related to semigroups of rational functions. In their paper, Hinkkanen and Martin extended the classical theory of the dynamics associated to the iteration of a rational function of one complex variable to the more general setting of an arbitrary semigroup of rational functions.

A transcendental semigroup G is a semigroup generated by a family of transcendental entire function $\{f_1, f_2, \ldots\}$ with the semigroup operation being functional composition. We denote the semigroup by $G = [f_1, f_2, \ldots]$. Thus each $g \in G$ is a transcendental entire function and G is closed under composition. For an introduction to iteration theory of entire functions see [5].

A family $\mathfrak{F}$ of meromorphic functions is normal in a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ if every sequence in $\mathfrak{F}$ has a subsequence which converges locally uniformly in D to a meromorphic function or to the constant ∞. The set of normality or the Fatou set $F(G)$ of a transcendental semigroup G, is the largest open subset of $\mathbb{C}$ on which the family of functions in G is normal. Thus $z_0 \in F(G)$ if it has a neighborhood U on which the family $\{g : g \in G\}$ is normal. The Julia set $J(G)$ of G is the complement of $F(G)$, that is $J(G) = \widetilde{\mathbb{C}} \setminus F(G)$. The semigroup generated by a single function g is denoted by $[g]$. In this case we denote $F([f])$ by $F(f)$ and $J([f])$ by $J(f)$ which are the respective Fatou set and Julia set in the classical Fatou-Julia theory of iteration of a single transcendental entire function. The dynamics of a semigroup is more complicated than those of a single function. Some of the properties in the classical

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37F10, 30D05.

Key words and phrases. Semigroup, normal family, Fatou set, periodic component.

The research work of the first author is supported by research fellowship from Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), New Delhi.

dynamics do not get preserved in the semigroup case. For instance $F(G)$ and $J(G)$ need not be completely invariant and $J(G)$ may not be the entire complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ even if $J(G)$ has an interior point, see [9]. In this paper we have generalised some of the dynamics of a transcendental entire function on its Fatou set to the dynamics of semigroup of transcendental entire functions. Furthermore the dynamics of conjugate semigroups and Abelian transcendental semigroups have also been investigated. Some work in this direction have been done by Poon [15] and Zhigang [18].

2. Results from iteration theory

Denote by $ind_{\zeta}\gamma$ the index of a curve $\gamma \subset \mathbb{C}$ with respect to a point ζ.

Theorem 2.1. *Let f be a transcendental entire function and U be a multiply connected component of the Fatou set $F(f)$. Then*

1. $f^n \to \infty$ *locally uniformly on* U
2. *Suppose γ is a Jordan curve that is not contractible in U. Then distance between $f^n(\gamma)$ and 0 is large. Also $ind_0 f^n(\gamma) > 0$ for all sufficiently large n and $ind_0 f^n(\gamma) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Theorem 2.2. *Let f be a transcendental entire function which is bounded on some curve Γ going to ∞. Then all the components of $F(f)$ are simply connected.*

Theorem 2.3. *Let f be a transcendental entire function. Then every unbounded component U of $F(f)$ is simply connected.*

Theorem 2.4. *Let f be a transcendental entire function. If $F(f)$ has an unbounded component U, then all components of $F(f)$ are simply connected.*

Theorem 2.5. *If f is a transcendental entire function, then $F(f)$ does not contain Herman rings.*

Theorem 2.6. *For any transcendental entire function f, any doubly connected component of $F(f)$ does not contain critical points of f.*

As an application of Picard's theorem and Theorem 2.4 one gets:

Theorem 2.7. *Let f be a transcendental entire function and $U \subset F(f)$ be a completely invariant domain. Then*

1. *U is unbounded;*
2. *all components of $F(f)$ are simply connected.*

For a proof of these results see Baker [1],[2],[3], and Hua and Yang [10]. In [12] using approximation theory of entire functions, the authors have shown the existence of entire functions f and g having infinite number of domains satisfying various properties and relating it to their composition. They explored and enlarged all the maximum possible ways of the solution in comparison to the past result worked out. It would be interesting to explore such relations for transcendental semigroup G and its constituent elements.

In analogy to the work in [9] on the classification of periodic components of $F(G)$ for a rational semigroup G, we give the classification of the dynamics of a transcendental semigroup on an invariant component V of $F(G)$. Let G be a transcendental semigroup and let U be a component of the Fatou set $F(G)$ of G. Denote by U_g the component of $F(G)$ containing $g(U)$. Define the *stabilizer* of U to be $G_U = \{g \in G : U_g = U\}$. If G_U is non-empty we say U is a stable basin for G. Given a stable basin U for G, it is

(1) attracting if U is a subdomain of an attracting basin of each $g \in G_U$;
(2) superattracting if U is a subdomain of a superattracing basin of each $g \in G_U$;
(3) parabolic if U is a subdomain of a parabolic basin of each $g \in G_U$;
(4) Siegel if U is a subdomain of a Siegel disk of each $g \in G_U$;
(5) Baker if U is a subdomain of a Baker domain of each $g \in G_U$.

We note that in the classical case a stable basin is one of the above types. We give some more definitions.

Definition 2.8. If G is a transcendental semigroup and U is a multiply connected component of $F(G)$, define $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U = \{g \in G : F(g)\,\text{has a multiply connected component}\,\widetilde{U}_g \supset U\}$. $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$ need not be a subsemigroup of G and so we consider the subsemigroup generated by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$ and throughout the text denote it by $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$ itself. Then $F(G) \subset F(\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U)$; in general equality may not hold, and it is interesting to know if U can be a proper subset of a component of $F(\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U)$.

Definition 2.9. Let G be a transcendental semigroup. A set W is forward invariant under G if $g(W) \subset W$ for all $g \in G$ and W is backward invariant under G if $g^{-1}(W) = \{w \in \mathbb{C} : g(w) \in W\} \subset W$ for all $g \in G$. W is called completely invariant under G if it is both forward and backward invariant under G. It is easily seen for a transcendental semigroup G, $F(G)$ is forward invariant and $J(G)$ is backward invariant [15].

Definition 2.10. A component U of $F(G)$ is called a wandering domain of G if the set $\{U_g : g \in G\}$ is infinite (where as usual U_g is the component of $F(G)$ containing $g(U)$). Otherwise U is called a preperiodic component of $F(G)$.

We state a famous result of Baker [2] concerning multiply connected domains of normality.

Theorem 2.11. *Let f be a transcendental entire function. Then a multiply connected component of $F(f)$ is bounded and wandering, and hence a pre-periodic component of $F(f)$ must be simply connected.*

This result has been generalised to the semigroup case by Zhigang [18].

Theorem 2.12. [18] *Let G be a transcendental semigroup Then a multiply connected component of $F(G)$ is bounded and wandering, and hence a pre-periodic component of $F(G)$ must be simply connected.*

3. Theorems and their proofs

We now give partial generalisation of some of Baker's result from classical theory of dynamics associated with the iteration of a transcendental entire function to the semigroup of transcendental entire functions. For a multiply connected component U of $F(G)$ recall definition 2.8 of the subsemigroup $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$ of G .

Theorem 3.1. *Let G be a transcendental semigroup and U a multiply connected component of $F(G)$, then for all $g \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$*

1. *$g^n \to \infty$ locally uniformly on U,*
2. *Suppose γ is a Jordan curve that is not contractible in U. Then distance between $g^n(\gamma)$ and 0 is large. Also $ind_0 g^n(\gamma) > 0$ for all sufficiently large n and $ind_0 g^n(\gamma) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof.

1. We have $F(G) \subset F(g)$ for all $g \in G$. For $g \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$, let $\widetilde{U}_g$ be a multiply connected component of $F(g)$ containing U. From Theorem 2.1 $g^n \to \infty$ locally uniformly on $\widetilde{U}_g$, and hence on U.
2. This is also evident from Theorem 2.1.

□

We will need the following definition of boundedness of a semigroup on a set.

Definition 3.2. A transcendental semigroup $G = [f_1, f_2, \ldots]$ is said to be bounded on a set A if all the generators in G are bounded on A.

Theorem 3.3. *Let G be a transcendental semigroup which is bounded on some curve Γ going to ∞. Then all components of $F(G)$ are simply connected.*

Proof. For all $g \in G, g(\Gamma)$ is bounded and so from Theorem 4.14 all components of $F(g)$ are simply connected. If U is a multiply connected component of $F(G)$ then for all $g \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U, F(g)$ has a multiply connected component $\widetilde{U}_g \supset U$ which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let G be a transcendental semigroup.Then every unbounded component U of $F(G)$ is simply connected.*

Proof. This is evident from Theorem 2.12. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let G be a transcendental semigroup. If $F(G)$ has an unbounded component U, then all components of $F(G)$ are simply connected.*

Proof. As $U \subset F(g)$ for all $g \in G$, there exists for each $g \in G$ an unbounded component U' of $F(g)$ with $U \subset U'$. By Theorem 2.4 all components of $F(g)$ are simply connected for all $g \in G$. It is now evident if $F(G)$ has a multiply connected component then we arrive at a contradiction. □

Theorem 3.6. *If G is a transcendental semigroup, then $F(G)$ does not contain Herman rings.*

Proof. This is evident from Theorem 2.5. □

Recall that $w \in \mathbb{C}$ is a critical value of a transcendental entire function f if there exists some $w_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ with $f(w_0) = w$ and $f'(w_0) = 0$. Here w_0 is called a critical point of f. The image of a critical point of f is a critical value of f. We now give definition of critical point and critical value of a transcendental semigroup G.

Definition 3.7. A point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ is called a critical point of G if it is a critical point of some $g \in G$. A point $w \in \mathbb{C}$ is called a critical value of G if it is a critical value of some $g \in G$.

Theorem 3.8. *For any transcendental semigroup G, any doubly connected component of $F(G)$ does not contain critical points of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$.*

Proof. Suppose U is a doubly connected component of $F(G)$. Then U is contained in a doubly connected component $\widetilde{U}_g$ of $F(g)$ for $g \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$. From Theorem 2.6 $\widetilde{U}_g$ does not contain critical points of g and so does U. □

Let G be a transcendental semigroup. If $U \subset F(G)$ is a domain which is completely invariant under some $g_0 \in G$, then

(1) U is unbounded;
(2) all components of $F(G)$ are simply connected.

Proof. (1) $U \subset F(G) \subset F(g_0)$, U is completely invariant under g_0 and so is unbounded by Theorem 2.7.
(2) There exists a component say U' of $F(G)$ which contains the unbounded domain U and so is itself unbounded. By Theorem 3.5 all components of $F(G)$ are simply connected.

□

4. Finitely generated transcendental semigroups

In this section we consider finitely generated transcendental semigroups. A semigroup $G = [g_1, \ldots, g_n]$ generated by finitely many functions is called finitely generated. Furthermore if $g_i \circ g_j = g_j \circ g_i$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, then G is called finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup. Poon [15] investigated some properties of Abelian transcendental semigroups and wandering domains of transcendental semigroups. Recall the Eremenko-Lyubich class $\mathcal{B} = \{f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C} \text{ transcendental entire } : \operatorname{Sing}(f^{-1}) \text{ is bounded}\}$ (where $\operatorname{Sing}(f^{-1})$ is the set of critical and asymptotic values of f). Each $f \in \mathcal{B}$ is said to be of bounded type. A transcendental entire function f is of finite type if $\operatorname{Sing} f^{-1}$ is a finite set. Furthermore if the transcendental entire functions f and g are of bounded type then so is $f \circ g$ as $\operatorname{Sing}\left((f \circ g)^{-1}\right) \subset \operatorname{Sing} f^{-1} \cup f(\operatorname{Sing}(g^{-1}))$, see [7]. Also if f and g are transcendental entire functions of bounded type with $f \circ g = g \circ f$, then $F(f) = F(g)$, see [11].

Theorem 4.1. [15] *For a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup $G = [g_1, \ldots, g_n]$ in which each g_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ is of finite type, $F(G) = F(g)$ for all $g \in G$.*

Remark 4.2. The given result can be generalised to a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup G in which each of the generators are of bounded type.

Theorem 4.3. *For a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup* $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ *in which each* g_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$ *is of bounded type,* $F(G) = F(g)$ *for all* $g \in G$.

Proof. Follows from Theorem 4.1 with finite type generators replaced by bounded type and with slight modifications. $\square$

It is well known if $f \in \mathcal{B}$ then all the components of $F(f)$ is simply connected. This follows from Theorem 2.1 and the fact that if f is a transcendental entire function of class $\mathcal{B}$, then the forward orbit of points in $F(f)$ does not approach ∞, see [8]. This result gets generalised to semigroup case.

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ *be a finitely generated transcendental semigroup in which each generator is of bounded type. Then all components of* $F(G)$ *are simply connected.*

Proof. If $U \subset F(G)$ is a multiply connected component then for each $g \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{G}}_U$ $U \subset \widetilde{U}_g$, where $\widetilde{U}_g$ is a multiply connected component of $F(g)$ which contradicts to g being of bounded type by above observation. $\square$

For two permutable transcendental entire functions f and g with $F(f) = F(g)$, if W is a domain of $F(f)$, then will W be a domain of $F(g)$ of the same class? This was a problem posed by Baker which has an affirmative answer when f and g are of finite type.

Theorem 4.5. [17] *Let* f *and* g *be transcendental entire functions of finite type and* $f \circ g = g \circ f$. *Then if* W *is a superattractive stable domain, an attractive stable domain, a parabolic stable domain or a Siegel disk of* f, *then* W *is also a superattractive stable domain, an attractive stable domain, a parabolic stable domain or a Siegel disk of* g, *respectively*

The given result can be generalised to a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup G in which each of the generators are of finite type.

Theorem 4.6. *Let* $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ *be an abelian transcedental semigroup in which each* g_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$ *is of finite type. If* $U \subset F(G)$ *is a superattractive stable domain, an attractive stable domain, a parabolic stable domain or a Siegel disk of* G, *then* U *is also a a superattractive stable domain, an attractive stable domain, a parabolic stable domain or a Siegel disk of* g *respectively for all* $g \in G$

Proof. For $g \in G_U$ this is clear by Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 4.1. Let $g \in G \setminus G_U$. For $f \in G_U, g \circ f = f \circ g$. As U is a stable basin of $F(f)$, by Theorem 4.5, U is also a stable basin of $F(g)$ of the same class and thus U is a stable basin of $F(g)$ of the same class for each $g \in G$. $\square$

For a transcendental entire function f, if all stable domains are bounded then $F(f)$ does not contain any asymptotic values of f, see [10].

Theorem 4.7. [10] *If f is a transcendental entire function whose stable domains are bounded, then $F(f)$ does not contain any asymptotic values of f.*

We now provide a condition under which $F(G)$ of a transcendental semigroup G does not contain any asymptotic values of G. We first state a lemma.

Lemma 4.8. [11] *Let f and g be two permutable transcendental entire entire functions. Then $F(f \circ g) \subset F(f) \cap F(g)$.*

Theorem 4.9. *Let $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ be a transcendental semigroup. If all stable domains of $F(g_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, are bounded, then $F(G)$ does not contain any asymptotic values of G.*

Proof. Let $z_0 \in F(G)$ be an asymptotic value of G, then $z_0 \in F(g)$ for all $g \in G$. By definition, z_0 is an asymptotic value of some $g \in G$. By hypothesis for all $g \in G$, all stable domains of $F(g)$ are bounded, we arrive at a contradiction by Theorem 4.7. ☐

We now study conjugate semigroups. Recall two entire functions f and g are conjugate if there exist a Mobius transformation $\phi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ with $\phi \circ f = g \circ \phi$.

Definition 4.10. Two finitely generated semigroups G and G' are said to be conjugate under a Mobius transformation $\phi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ if

1. they have same number of generators,
2. corresponding generators are conjugate under ϕ.

If $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ we represent the conjugate semigroup G' by $G' = [\phi \circ g_1 \circ \phi^{-1} \dots, \phi \circ g_n \circ \phi^{-1}]$ where $\phi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is the conjugating map.

If f and g are two rational functions which are conjugate under some Mobius transformation $\phi : \widetilde{\mathbb{C}} \to \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}$, then it is well known [4], $\phi(F(f)) = F(g)$. We now show the dynamics of G and G' are similar for a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup in which each generator is of finite type. We will use Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.11. *Let $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ be a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup in which each $g_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ is of finite type and let $G' = [\phi \circ g_1 \circ \phi^{-1} \dots, \phi \circ g_n \circ \phi^{-1}]$ where $\phi : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is the conjugating map, be the conjugate semigroup. Then $\phi(F(G)) = F(G')$.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 4.1 and observation made in above paragraph. ☐

Remark 4.12. The conjugate semigroup G' in above theorem is also Abelian and of finite type.

Remark 4.13. The given result can be generalised to a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup G in which each of the generators are of bounded type.

We now show a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup G in which each of the generators are of finite type has neither wandering domains nor Baker domains.

Theorem 4.14. *Suppose $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ is a finitely generated Abelian transcendental semigroup in which each $g_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ is of finite type. Then G has no wandering domains.*

Proof. This is evident from Theorem 4.1 ☐

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose $G = [g_1, \dots, g_n]$ is a finitely generated transcendental semigroup in which each $g_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ is of bounded type. Then G has no Baker domain.*

Proof. Suppose $U \subset F(G)$ is a Baker domain. From classification theorem in Section 2, for all $g \in G_U, U$ is a subdomain of a Baker domain contained in $F(g)$ which is a contradiction as $F(g)$ has no Baker domain for all $g \in G$. ☐

Acknowledgement. We are thankful to Kaushal Verma, IISC Bangalore for his helpful comments and suggestions.

References

[1] I. N. Baker, The domains of normality of an entire function. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A. I. Math. **1** (1975), 277-283.

[2] I. N. Baker, Wandering domains in the iteration of entire functions, Proc. London Math. Soc. **49** (1984), 563-576.

[3] I. N. Baker, Some entire functions with multiply-connected wandering domains, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, **5** (1985),163-169.

[4] A. F. Beardon, *Iteration of rational functions*, Springer Verlag, (1991).

[5] W. Bergweiler, Iteration of meromorphic functions, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (1993), 151-188.

[6] W. Bergweiler, M. Haruta, H. Kriete, H. G. Meier and N. Terglane, On the limit functions of iterates in wandering domain, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A. I. Math. **18** (1993), 369-375.

[7] W. Bergweiler and Y. Wang, On the dynamics of composite entire functions. Ark. Math. **36** (1998), 31-39.

[8] A. E. Eremenko and M. Yu. Lyubich, Dynamical properties of some classes of entire functions, Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble, **42** (1992), 989-1020.

[9] A. Hinkkanen and G. J. Martin, The dynamics of semigroups of rational functions I, Proc. London. Math. Soc. (3) **73** (1996), 358-384

[10] X. H. Hua and C. C. Yang, *Dynamics of transcendental functions*, Gordon and Breach Science Pub. (1998).

[11] X. H. Hua and X. L. Wang, Dynamics of permutable transcendental entire functions, Acta Mathematica Vietnamica (3) **27** (2002), 301-306.

[12] D. Kumar, G. Datt and S. Kumar, Dynamics of composite entire functions, arXiv:math.DS/12075930, submitted for publication.

[13] J. Milnor, *Dynamics in One Complex Variable*, (third edition), Annals of Math. Studies **160**, Princeton U. Press, (2006).

[14] S. Morosawa, Y. Nishimura, M. Taniguchi and T. Ueda, *Holomorphic dynamics*, Cambridge Univ. Press, (2000).

[15] K. K. Poon, Fatou-Julia theory on transcendental semigroups, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **58** (1998), 403-410.

[16] K. K. Poon, Fatou-Julia theory on transcendental semigroups II, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **59** (1999), 257-262.

[17] F. Y. Ren and W. S. Li, An affirmative answer to a problem of Baker, J. Fudan Univ. **36** (1997), 231-233.

[18] H. Zhigang, The dynamics of semigroups of transcendental meromorphic functions, Tsinghua Science and Technology, (4) **9** (2004), 472-474

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF DELHI, DELHI–110 007, INDIA
E-mail address: `dinukumar680@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DEEN DAYAL UPADHYAYA COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF DELHI, DELHI–110 007, INDIA
E-mail address: `sanjpant@gmail.com`